UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,802	09/15/2003	Richard B. Cass	P23,612-B USA	3480
	7590 05/15/200 OT & LECHNER, LLP	EXAMINER		
1101 MARKET		THOMPSON, CAMIE S		
SUITE 2600 PHILADELPHI	IA, PA 19107-2950		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurrence	10/664,802	CASS, RICHARD B.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Camie S. Thompson	1794				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Electi</u>	ion filed 2/10/06.					
<i>;</i> —	,—					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-17</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-17</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers	·					
· · · <u> </u>	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
	priority under 35 LLS C S 110(a)	(d) or (f)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Discreption of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	atent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/664,802 Page 2

Art Unit: 1794

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election of group II, claims 16-17, dated February 10, 2006 is acknowledged. Applicant elected species O drawn to different electrodes. Claims 16-17 have been amended on March 26, 2007. As amended, claim 17 is not drawn to a fiber assembly. Claim 17 is drawn to a portion. Examiner is interpreting a portion as to refer to a section of the fiber assembly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 3-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Safari et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,615,466.

Safari discloses a ceramic fiber fabrication that comprises sintered fibers of piezoelectric material (see column 3, line 55-column 4, line 14). Claims 16 and 17 are product-by-process claims. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. See MPEP 2113. The Safari reference discloses a fiber assembly as do the present claims. The manner in which the fiber assembly was process

does not make the fiber assembly in the Safari reference different from that of fiber assembly of the present claims.

4. Claims 3-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Card et al., U.S. Patent Number 4,933,230.

Card discloses composites that are comprised of woven mats that comprise piezoelectric sintered fibers (see column 4, line 5-column 6, line 44). Claims 16 and 17 are product-by-process claims. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. See MPEP 2113. The Safari reference discloses a fiber assembly as do the present claims. The manner in which the fiber assembly was process does not make the fiber assembly in the Safari reference different from that of fiber assembly of the present claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Camie S. Thompson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached at (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the Group is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Application/Control Number: 10/664,802 Page 4

Art Unit: 1794

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Bruce H Hess/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794